

000000 00. 09/876,049

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 40-42, 70-89, and 107-134 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 11, 40, 70, 84, 88, 107, 108, 110, 112, 118, 119, 124-127, 129, and 130 have been amended and claims 12-39, 43-69, and 90-106 have been canceled. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

At the outset, Applicants would like to thank the examiner for extending Applicant's representative an interview on April 11, 2005 to discuss the rejections in the Final Office Action. During the interview, differences between the claimed invention and the cited references were discussed. While no final agreement was reached, the examiner indicated that he would postpone his decision concerning the patentability of the claims pending receipt of this paper. The differences discussed during the interview have been reiterated below for the examiner's consideration.

I. The Rejection under 35 USC § 102(e).

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-7, 11, 40, 41, 70-74, 77-79, 109-120, and 122 were rejected for being anticipated by the Hansson publication. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites a method for communicating voice information between a wireless phone and a hard-wired telephone. The wireless phone is "electrically coupled to base unit" which includes "(i) a connector coupled to a call processing circuit" and "(ii) a communication port coupled to the connector." When the wireless phone receives a call, the call is connected from the wireless phone to the hard-wired telephone.

000000 00. 09/876,049

Claim 1 further recites that the connecting step is automatically performed by connection management software programmed into the wireless phone, and that this software "connects the call through a communications interface between the communications port of the base unit and a communications port of the hard-wired telephone." The communications interface may, for example, be a standard telephone cable. The Hansson publication does not disclose these features.

The Hansson publication discloses a call-forwarding operation between a wireless phone and hard-wired telephone. The operation is performed when the wireless phone is connected to a battery charger 123 in Figure 1. When a call is received, the wireless phone retrieves a pre-stored telephone number corresponding to a hard-wired telephone. The wireless phone then forwards the call to the hard-wired telephone number to complete the call-forwarding operation. (See page 5, lines 12-29).

Unlike the claimed invention, the Hansson publication does not disclose that its wireless phone is electrically coupled to a base unit having (i) a connector coupled to a call processing circuit in the wireless phone, and (ii) a communications port coupled to the connector. Moreover, Hansson does not disclose that connection management software programmed into its wireless phone "connects the call through a communications interface between the communications port of the base unit and a communications port of the hard-wired telephone." Instead, the wireless phone of Hansson merely performs a call forwarding operation through a mobile communications network. The call is never sent through a communications port of the base unit and received by communications port of the hard-wired telephone through a communications interface as recited in claim 1.

000000 00. 09/876,049

Because the Hansson publication does not disclose all the features of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Hansson cannot anticipate this claim. It is further submitted that these differences are sufficient to render claim 1 and its dependent claims non-obvious and thus patentable over Hansson.

Claim 11 recites a method which includes receiving a call on a wireless phone and connecting the call from the wireless phone to a hard-wired telephone. The connecting step is automatically preformed by connection management software programmed into the wireless phone. Claim 11 further recites that the connecting step "is preformed based on authorization information stored on a smart card." The Hansson publication does not disclose these features.

Moreover, the Examiner relied on the Pfundstein patent to reject this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Pfundstein patent discloses a smart card which stores a caller ID number. However, that smart card does not store authorization information which enables a call received on a wireless phone to be connected to a hard-wired telephone, based on connection management software programmed into the wireless phone. Instead, Pfundstein's smart card merely allows a subscriber to send a call through a mobile communications network. See column 3, lines, 31-56.

Because the Pfundstein patent does not teach or suggest a smart card which stores authorization information which enables a call to be connected from a wireless phone to hard-wired telephone, neither the Hansson publication taken alone nor a Hansson-Pfundstein combination can render claim 11 unpatentable. For at least these reasons it is respectfully submitted that claim 11 and its dependent claims are allowable.

000000 00. 09/876,049

Claim 40 recites features similar to those which patentably distinguish claim 1 from the Hansson publication. For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 40 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 70 recites a system wherein connection management software stored in a wireless device automatically connects a call received by the wireless device to a hard-wired telephone. The call is connected using an interface unit which includes a connector that mates with a voice communications port of a wireless device. Claim 70 also recites that the "software connects the call through a communications interface between a communications port of the interface unit and communications port of a hard-wired telephone." The Hanson publication does not disclose these features. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 70 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 109 recites that the connection management software of claim 1 "converts an operational mode of the wireless phone from a standard operating mode to an interface mode for connecting calls between the wireless phone and hard-wired telephone." This connection management software is not disclosed by Hansson, and neither are any other the features of claim 109. It is therefore submitted that claim 109 is allowable for these additional reasons.

Claim 110 recites that the processor automatically performs the conversion "in response to a detection signal indicating that the wireless phone is connected to the base unit between the wireless phone and hard-wired telephone." The Hansson publication does not include the base unit and does not perform a conversion in response to a detection signal as recited in claim 110. Claim 110 is therefore allowable for these additional reasons.

000000 00. 09/876,049

Claims 111 and 112 recite features similar to claims 109 and 110 but depending from claim 40. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 111 and 112 are also allowable.

Claim 114 recites that the interface unit includes a stud, and that a function button on the wireless device is activated by contact from the stud when the voice communication port or wireless device is mated with the connector of the interface unit. The Hansson publication does not disclose these features, i.e., the unit 123 of Hansson is merely a battery charger. This charger does not have a stud which activates a function button on a wireless device for purposes of performing the function of the determining means recited in claim 72. It is therefore submitted that claim 114 is allowable.

Claim 115 recites a specific structure of the determining means which is not disclosed by the Hansson publication.

Claim 116 recites "a detector which detects when the voice communication port of the wireless device mates with the connector of the interface unit, and then sends a mode signal to the connection management software for connecting calls between the wireless device and hard-wired telephone." The Hansson publication does not disclose any of these features.

Claim 118 further defines the invention of claim 111, and specifically recites that the authorization information includes at least a wireless phone user telephone number. The Hansson publication does not disclose these features.

Claim 119 recites that a processor "reconfigures the wireless communications unit to receive a call a different wireless user telephone number when different authorization information is received through the keypad." Hansson does not disclose these features.

000000 00. 09/876,049

Claim 120 recites that the processor reconfigures the wireless communications unit in response to activation of a mode button. The Hansson patent does not disclose these features.

Claim 122 recites that the different authorization information includes at least the different wireless phone user telephone number. The Hansson publication does not disclose any of these features.

II. The Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a).

Claims 8 and 9 were rejected for being obvious over a Hansson-DePani combination. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

The DePani patent was cited for its disclosure of determining the validity of a dialed telephone number. The DePani patent, however, does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1 missing from the Hansson publication. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 8 and 9 are allowable over the cited combination at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Claims 11 and 88 were rejected for being obvious over a Hansson-Pfundstein combination. This rejection is traversed for the reasons noted above with regard to claim 11, which applies analogously to claim 88.

Claim 42 was rejected for being obvious over a Hansson-Fuentes combination. This rejection is traversed on grounds that the Fuentes patent fails to teach or suggest the features of base claim 40 missing from the Hansson publication.

000000 00. 09/876,049

Claims 75 and 76 were rejected for being obvious over a Hansson-DePani-Kweon combination. Claims 75 and 76 depend from claim 70. Neither the DePani patent nor the Kweon patent teaches or suggests the features of claim 70 missing from the Hansson publication. It is therefore submitted that claims 75 and 76 are allowable over the cited combination at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 70.

Claims 81, 82, 84, and 86 were rejected for being obvious over a Hansson-Fintel combination. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 84 recites that the interface unit includes "a processor which controls a **time of day** when the connectors are activated." The Hansson publication does not teach or suggest these features.

Concerning Fintel, this patent discloses processing calls based on time activation information, i.e., the number of minutes a phone is activated to be used in determining connection charges or the time a phone is first activated for use by a subscriber. Claim 84, however, recites that the interface unit processor controls a time of day (e.g., nighttime, specific hours of operation, etc.) when connectors of the interface unit are to be activated. As explained during the interview, this is beneficial, for example, when multiple users live in a house and the activation times of different connectors are specified. Thus, the daughter in a family may receive calls on the house's hard-wired phone through her cell phone mounted in a first connector between 7 pm and 9pm, and the brother in the family may receive calls on the house's hard-wired phone through his cell phone mounted in a second connector 2 between 9 pm and 11 pm.

000000 00. 09/876,049

The Fintel patent does not teach or suggest these features. It is therefore submitted that claim 84 is allowable over the cited combination, not only by virtue of the features recited in base claim 70 but also for these additional reasons.

Claims 81, 82, and 86 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 70.

Claim 83 was rejected for being obvious over a Hansson-Fintel-Kazemzadeh combination. Applicant traverses this rejection on grounds that the Fintel and Kazemzadeh patents do not teach or suggest the features of base claim 70 missing from the Hansson publication. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 83 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 70.

Claim 85 was rejected for being obvious over a Hansson-Fintel-Numminen combination. Applicant traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 85 recites that the interface unit includes "a selector which allows a user to manually control an activation state of at least one of the connectors." The Numminen patent discloses a selector for selecting when a mobile terminal is placed in a test mode or a test loop. (See column 11, lines 5-18). However, as discussed during the interview, the Numminen patent does not teach or suggest that the selector allows a user to manually control an activation state of at least one of the connectors and an interface unit which includes a voice communication port coupled to a communications interface as recited in claim 70. Absent the teaching or suggestion of these features, it is respectfully submitted that claim 85 is allowable over the cited combination.

000000 00. 09/876,049

Claim 87 was rejected for being obvious over a Hansson-Fintel-Numminen-Suikola combination. Claim 87 recites that a graphical interface unit "displays information indicative of activation status of the connectors and includes means for allowing a user to change said activation status." (Emphasis added). None of the cited references teach or suggest a graphical interface unit which displays information of this type.

Claim 89 was rejected for being obvious over a Hansson-Dohrmann combination. This rejection is traversed on grounds that the Dohrmann patent does not teach or suggest the features of base claim 70 missing from the Hansson publication. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 89 is allowable.

Claims 107 and 108 were rejected for being obvious over a Torrey-Lipsit combination. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 107 recites a hard-wired telephone which includes a processor for automatically setting the wireless communication unit to receive a call from a wireless service provider at a changeable wireless phone user telephone number. Thus, for example, the hard-wired telephone can be modified to receive calls from different wireless telephone numbers. This functionality is further highlighted by the recitation that the processor automatically sets the wireless communication unit "to a new wireless phone user telephone number in response to receiving said activation information through the keypad." The cited references do not teach or suggest these features.

As discussed during the interview, this invention is beneficial, for example, in a hotel setting where the hard-wired phone in a room can be re-programmed to receive calls through the cell phone of each person who rents the room.

000000 00. 09/876,049

The Torrey patent discloses sending a call from a wireless phone to a hard-wired telephone. Torrey, however, does not teach or suggest the processor recited in claim 107.

The Lipsit patent discloses a memory unit for storing activation information input through a keypad. This activation information permits a new subscriber to use the phone to make cellular calls, and/or indicates when the phone is first activated - that is, the phone is configured by a salesman with the initial activation parameters required to activate the phone.

However, Lipsit does not teach or suggest a hard-wired telephone which includes a processor which automatically sets a wireless communication unit to a new wireless phone user telephone number in response to receiving said activation information through the keypad. Absent of teaching or suggesting these features, it is respectfully submitted that claim 107 is allowable over a Torrey-Lipsit combination.

Claim 108 recites features similar to those which patentably distinguishes claim 107 from the cited combination.

Claim 121 was rejected for being obvious over a Hansson-Eschke combination. This claim recites that a processor "overwrites the different authorization information over the previously stored authorization information in the memory unit." Eschke was cited for its disclosure of overwriting authorization information in a memory unit. However, this authorization information does not configure a wireless communication unit to receive a call at a different wireless phone user telephone number as recited in claim 119, from which claim 121 depends. For at least these reasons, it is submitted that claim 121 is allowable over the cited combination.

000000 00. 09/876,049

Claims 123 and 129-134 are rejected for being obvious over a Hansson-Mead combination. The Mead patent discloses authorization information including a user identification code. However, Mead does not teach or suggest the features of claims 111 and 40 from which claim 123 depends.

Claim 129 recites a hard-wired telephone which includes a processor which automatically sets a wireless communication unit to a new wireless phone user telephone number based on authorization information read by a reader. Neither of the cited references teaches or suggests these features. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 129 and its dependent claims are allowable over a Hansson-Mead combination.

Claims 124-126 were rejected for being obvious over a Hansson-Cervantes combination. Claim 124 recites that "a processor receives time-of-day activation information entered through a keyboard and automatically sets the wireless communication unit to receive a call from the wireless service provider at the changeable wireless telephone number based on said time-of-day activation information." (Emphasis added).

Cervantes discloses time-of-activation information entered through a keypad. However, this activation information is for activating an answerback signal function, not to determine when a base unit is activated for purposes of forwarding a call from a wireless phone to a hard-wired telephone, as recited in base claim 40.

Claims 125 and 126 recite additional features based on the time-of-day activation information, none of which are taught or suggested by the cited references.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 124-126 are allowable over the cited combination.

000000 00. 09/876,049

Claims 127 and 128 were rejected for being obvious over a Hansson-Lipsit combination. As previously discussed, the Lipsit patent discloses programming activation parameters to activate a cellular phone such as when first purchased by a subscriber. As disclosed at column 8, this may include a date and time when the new telephone number is programmed into the cellular phone during an activation procedure. The Lipsit patent does not teach or suggest a processor which receives time-of-day activation information which "automatically sets the wireless communication unit to receive a call from the wireless service provider at the changeable wireless telephone user number based on the time-of-day activation information." Rather, Lipsit merely discloses when a phone is activated, not times of day when such a phone is activated (e.g., from the hours of 7 pm to 8 pm, etc.).

These features are recited in base claim 124, therefore it is submitted that claim 127 is allowable at least by virtue of at least these features.

Claim 128 recites similar features in its base claim. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 128 is allowable.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of all the rejections and objections made by the Examiner is hereby respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application is respectfully requested.


Should the Examiner believe that further amendments are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, or if the Examiner believes that a personal interview would be advantageous in order to more expeditiously resolve any remaining issues, the

000000 00. 09/876,049

Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with this application, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 16-0607 and credit any excess fees to the same Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,




Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

Carl R. Wesolowski
Registration No. 40,372

FLESHNER & KIM, LLP
P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
Facsimile No: (703) 766-3644
Telephone No: (703) 766-3701

Certificate of Transimssion under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on April 12, 2005.


Signature